

Date: Wed, 11 May 94 04:30:09 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #199
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 11 May 94 Volume 94 : Issue 199

Today's Topics:

 6-meters band usage.
 Internet -> packet gateway policy
 Licencing cost
 Music allowed on ham bands??
 SBS club call? (was Re: Upgraded license expiration question)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 9 May 1994 17:02:55 +0000
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
pipex!demon!g8sjp.demon.co.uk!ip@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 6-meters band usage.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2qku0k\$2og@cismsun.univ-lyon1.fr> elendir@enst.fr "Elendir" writes:

> Hi and 73 !

Ca va?

> Im going to ask for 6-meters permit here in France. However, our
> authorization is only valid from 50.2 to 51.2 MHz. Could you tell me what
> kind of traffic mode is assigned on this slice ? SSB ? CW ? SSTV ?

UK 50MHz Bandplan:

-50.000-		
CW	50.020 - 50.080	Beacons
only	50.090	CW calling
-50.100-		
	50.100 - 50.130	Intercontinental DX window
SSB	50.110	Intercontinental calling
and	50.185	Crossband activity centre
CW	50.200	SSB calling
only	50.300	CW MS calling
	50.350	SSB MS calling
-50.500-		
	50.510	SSTV
All	50.550	FAX
	50.600	AFSK RTTY
Modes	50.630 - 50.750	Packet Radio
-51.000-		
SSB and		
CW only	51.110	VK / ZL calling
-51.125-		
All modes	51.210	Emergency communications priority
-51.410-		
FM	51.410 - 51.590	FM telephony
simplex	51.510	FM calling
channels	51.530	Used by GB2RS news broadcasts (sunday mornings)
-51.830-		
All	51.940 - 52.000	Emergency communications priority
Modes		
-52.000-		

As a result, you can look for me on 50.220MHz SSB during the 4/5 June IARU Region 1 50MHz contest. I think there may well be one or two well-equipped US stations active that weekend, too :-)

--

Iain Philipps

Date: 9 May 94 11:47:15 -0500
 From: envoy.wl.com!reeve.research.aa.wl.com!aa.wl.com!pennind@decwrl.dec.com
 Subject: Internet -> packet gateway policy
 To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I think he's worried that internet exchanges will replace the entire traffic handling system used by packet. Tell him to get with the program...probably still using the code...

Don N2JYK

In article <2prduc\$c56@hpbab.mentorg.com>, hanko@wv.mentorg.com (Hank Oredson) writes:
> In article <JKA.94Apr26101230@mustang.ece.cmu.edu>, jka@ece.cmu.edu (Jay Adams) writes:
> |>
> |> A local amateur radio operator recently complained about my use of an
> |> internet to packet gateway, asserting that such a gateway constitutes
> |> use of the amateur packet network by non-amateurs. I am a licensed
> |> amateur, but that's not the point. I assume that someone has worked
> |> out all the legal technicalities of these gateways. What should I
> |> tell this guy to make him leave me alone?
> |>
> |> - Jay
>
> Hope he complains about any NTS traffic as well ...
>
> In my mind, the proper response to these "network cops"
> goes along the lines of "Stick it in you ear, idiot."
>
> ... Hank
>
> --
>
> Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics
> Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com
> Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NOAM

Date: Mon, 9 May 94 15:50:46 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!alberta!
adec23!mark@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Licencing cost
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jgrubs@voxbox.norden1.com (Jim Grubs, W8GRT) writes:

>> Our licenses are lifetime, too. It's the *station* license that costs \$26
>> per annum.
>I'd be willing to pay \$26 a year if it meant we would get decent service from
>the FCC, including vigorous enforcement against non-amateur use of ham bands.

You won't, the service we get from Industry Canada is being minimized and only well documented cases will be handled (much as it is in the US). The \$26CAN/year (~\$17US) is used to cover the beaurocracy to handle licensing IN A TIMELY MANNER, the purchase of equipment to pinpoint the signals of violators,

the cost of all well documented cases of police action, administrators that try their best to help the community in the role of an advisor and the salary of the persons answering the phone listening to a bunch of crybabies ...

I think *long* before any licensing fee can add to the service you are currently getting from the FCC must be covered by the fees (which they are not, obviously). I think you may be surprised at just how expensive their operations are and how much of a free ride you are getting, funded by general revenue ... In other words, if you want enforcement, I believe you will need to pay on the order of \$50US/year ...

Ciao, 73 de VE6MGS/Mark -sk-

Date: 10 May 94 19:23:01 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!
falcon.bgsu.edu!fyfe@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Music allowed on ham bands??
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CpE101.n57@world.std.com>
howi@world.std.com (howie cahn) writes:

> Similarly, 97.113(a)(4) also says:
> "No amateur shall transmit:
> ... obscene or indecent words or language."
>
> This says to me that images are not covered here. In that case obscenity
> would only be covered by the Constitution and applicable Federal and local
> laws. That would allow you to transmit, say, a GIF of a Playboy-style
> photo, since they are not considered obscene under general law.

It seems to me that one does an injustice to the rule by interpreting it literally instead of it's intent. I don't want to get into some big squabble about it but it seems to this amateur that most would read the rule to say that they don't want you to transmit obscene stuff...period. That is the *intent* of the law. Maybe you are correct in the *letter* of the law not covering all modes but I think that the higher order is the intent.

*Bob Fyfe, KG8FU, NREMT-I "A King's Kid" John 1.12 *

*Phone: (419) 372-2103 *
*Bitnet: BFYFE@TRAPPER -or- FYFE@BGSUOPIE *
*Internet: fyfe@andy.bgsu.edu -or- bfyfe@trapper.bgsu.edu *
US Post: c/o Comp.Servs.,Rm.123 Hayes, BGSU, Bowling Green,OH 43403

Date: 10 May 94 21:58:14 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!rkarlqu@hplabs.hpl.hp.com
Subject: SBS club call? (was Re: Upgraded license expiration question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>This same thing happened to a chap in Atlanta early in the callsign
>setup. He was issued KB4FU...used it and never thought about it until
>someone in the mall parking lot asked his wife about the "obsenity" on
>her license tag... suddenly, Tom got all bent out of shape, and in his

Then we have the case of W7FU, who specifically **requested** that
call (back in 1977 when you could do that). And no, those aren't his
initials.

Rick Karlquist N6RK
rkarlqu@scd.hp.com

Date: Mon, 9 May 1994 13:30:20 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.moneng.mei.com!uwm.edu!
mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CpCCo0.EKn@calvin.edu>, <1994May6.185617.27430@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
<2qfp70\$ppqq@proffa.cc.tut.fi>.com
Subject : Re: Gilder's Concerns

In <2qfp70\$ppqq@proffa.cc.tut.fi> k23690@proffa.cc.tut.fi (Kein{nen Paul) writes:

>Spread spectrum is not the answer to all frequency management problems.
>We still need some allocations for services that are not compatible
>with spread spectrum such as radio astronomy or weak signal communications
>(eg. amateur EME). The direct sequence SS is particularly problematic,
>as it dilutes the signal all over a large band at allmost constant
>amplitude (sin x/x distribution). A single SS-transmitter is not a
>problem, as the power/bandwidth density is low, but if you have
>100 or 1000 SS-transmitters, the background noise goes up by 20 dB
>or 30 dB compared to a single SS-transmitter. Most weak signal
>services can not tolerate such increas in background noise or you
>have to use more transmitting power and/or larger antennas.

True. This assumes you are not allowed to change the "center frequency"

about which you "spread" your signal. As described in other articles, the point at which problems occur is a "soft" limit. Data is not simply stopped like a brick wall. Because it is digital, interleave and error detection and correction allow the data to still get through, though perhaps at not the rate you intended.

Since data IS still getting through, why not agree to change the center frequency and move all about the band till things get better? It sounds as if that is what Steinbrecher is doing. Of course, this DOES put a strain on the wide-band final amplifier. SWR will continue to be a problem, even with a wide-band antenna. For high speed, local communication, it is still very DOable.

As far as HF, it remains to be seen what can be done with high-speed DSP chips as applied to both DS and FH SS. The key is an adaptive, intelligent approach that Steinbrecher seems to think can be done on-the-fly. So long as we continue to believe that the hardware must use the same pseudorandom spreading sequence about a fixed center frequency or, in the case of FH, the same unchanging hopping sequence, problems will continue to occur. You need to be "smart". You must adapt and move on-the-fly. Apparently, with Steinbrecher's wide-band mixer and the application of today's off-the-shelf DSP chips, it can be done.

>[About the Steinbrecher approach]

>I did not quite understand how the Steinbrecher's "adaptive" approach
>works in real life situations with a large number of stations.
>If all stations use omnidirectional antennas and the path loss between
>all stations are constant, then it should work.

>But there is the hidden transmitter problem. Assume station A is sending
>messages to B. Station C wants to use the same frequency, but it doesn't
>hear station A and thus assumes that the frequency is free and starts
>transmitting. If B can hear C, this can prevent B from receiving more
>messages from A.

Yes. But that is just ONE frequency out of hundreds to perhaps thousands that a well designed DS spread spectrum device uses. Again, you EXPECT hits and interference occaisionally. That is why data interleave is used.

>IMHO, we still need frequency coordination, but large contiguous bands
>should be allocated to spread spectrum and compatible services, but there
>is no need for frequency management within these sections as the dynamic
>management can do a better job.

Indeed, there will ALWAYS be a need for certain narrow band applications.
But the fact is, with SS and beyond, THERE IS NO FREQUENCY SHORTAGE.

Simply hook up a spectrum analyzer to the band of your choice using
a good external antenna. Hell, just watch the business bands or
cellular bands even during rush hour. There are signals coming and
going constantly. BUT, there is an incredible amount of dead
time on ALL narrow band channels when looked at over time. If you
took each individual FCC allocated slot and looked at the total on
to off time and averaged them all together you would find that
yes, we are not using the spectrum efficiently with this narrow
band "this-frequency-is-mine" approach.

```
--  
/`- _      kevin.jessup@mixcom.com  
{      }/      Marquette Electronics, Inc  
 \      /      N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio  
 |__*|      N9SQB @ WD9ANY.#MKE.WI.USA.NA
```

Date: 9 May 1994 16:57:02 GMT
From: news.mentorg.com!newsgw.mentorg.com!hpbab33.mentorg.com!wv.mentorg.com!
hanko@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <ddtodd.63.0016E34F@ucdavis.edu>, <phb.768060210@melpar>,
<VBREault.94May5152253@rinhp750.gmr.com>
Reply-To : Hank_Oredson@mentorg.com
Subject : Re: [News] FCC Gets New Weapon

In article <VBREault.94May5152253@rinhp750.gmr.com>, vbreault@rinhp750.gmr.com
(Val Breault) writes:

|> <I lost the attribution>

|>

|> >>the radio salesman. Maybe there should also be a penalty for the sales-

|> >>man/dealer who doesn't *actively* inform his customers of the rules...

Sure ... right ... let's have the dealers get signatures when:

you buy an ice crusher

("I understand that placing my hand into the ice crusher when it
is running may cause serious injury.")

or fishing tackle

("I swear I will not operate this equipment without the appropriate license, and understand that improper operation may result in injury from sharp fish hooks.")

or TV sets

("I understand that certain material offensive to me might appear on the screen of this TV set, and have had proper training in the use of both the channel selector and the on/off switch which are provided by the manufacturer so that I can avoid such material.")

light bulbs

("I understand that light bulbs should not be throws from high building as they may cause injury to those passing by below the building. I hereby promise that I will not use this lightbulb in any but the approved manner, and in particular will never throw it from a high building.")

And if any such events described above take place, we should certainly hold the dealer fully responsible.

I find the views put forth by some folks on this thread to be silly in the extreme. "I refuse to be accountable for my actions, put the blame on the person who sold me the radio." seems to be the common thread here. Perhaps the simple solution is to assign a "monitor" to each of these folks - watch them every minute so they cannot do themselves or others any harm. We even have a name for these monitors:

"Baby Sitters"

... Hank

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics
Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NOAM

Date: 10 May 94 17:49:55 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!
news.eecs.nwu.edu!ahab.eecs.nwu.edu!hpa@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <phb.768060210@melpar>, <VBREAUULT.94May5152253@rinhp750.gmr.com>,
<2qlq0u\$fdo@hpbab.wv.mentorg.com>

Reply-To : hpa@nwu.edu (H. Peter Anvin)

Subject : Re: [News] FCC Gets New Weapon

Followup to: <2qlq0u\$fdo@hpbab.wv.mentorg.com>

By author: Hank_Oredson@mentorg.com

In newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy

>

> or TV sets

>

> ("I understand that certain material offensive to me might appear
> on the screen of this TV set, and have had proper training in
> the use of both the channel selector and the on/off switch which
> are provided by the manufacturer so that I can avoid such material.")
>

This would not necessarily be a bad idea... would keep the
archconservative pro-censorship league at bay...

/hpa

--

INTERNET: hpa@nwu.edu

FINGER/TALK: hpa@ahab.eecs.nwu.edu

IBM MAIL: I0050052 at IBMMAIL

HAM RADIO: N9ITP or SM4TKN

FIDONET: 1:115/511 or 1:115/512

STORMNET: 181:294/101

To the memory of Richard Nixon we will now dedicate 18 1/2 minutes of silence.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #199
